



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,764	05/14/2001	Carlos A. Hoyos		8884

7590 04/06/2006

Michael Cohen
8350 Wilshire Blvd ste 200
Beverly Hill, CA 90211

EXAMINER

MISLEH, JUSTIN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/854,764	Applicant(s) HOYOS, CARLOS A.	
	Examiner Justin P. Misleh	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11 October 2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed October 11, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 1 – 18

3. With respect to Claim 1, Applicant mainly argues, "There is no motivation for an addition of the third orthogonal axis to provide a 'greater degree movement,' because one of ordinary skill in the art (of surveying) would not require a such an addition since the art of surveying does not require this added third degree of freedom. Surveying merely requires a horizontal and/or vertical freedom, as is clearly taught in Viney (column 5, line 1). Furthermore, the platform of Viney is already stable on a tripod. Therefore, it is not understood why at the time the invention was made, one with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include an imaging platform that is capable of controllable motion about three orthogonal axis, as purportedly taught by Tyler, in the remote control imaging system, as purportedly disclosed

Art Unit: 2622

by Viney, as a means 'to provide a gyroscopically stable imaging platform with a greater degree movement.'”

4. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's position. Viney is directed towards a “method and apparatus for controlling a total station to locate a target” (see column 1, lines 6 – 8). Furthermore, Viney expressly states “[o]ne problem associated with many robotic total stations is that they tend to have difficulty locating the target ... [c]onsequently, with many robotic total stations, the user at the target frequently must return to the total station to make fine tuning adjustments” (see column 1, lines 40 – 45). Finally, Viney concludes, “what is needed is a total station ... which can not only be operated by a single user, but also provides the user with greater freedom of movement” (see column, lines 53 – 58). In an analogous art, Tyler also is directed towards “aiming an instrument at a target object” (see column, lines 9 and 10). Furthermore, Tyler indicates the improvement over the prior art lies within providing a “gyroscopically stabilized apparatus ... for aiming a camera ... at a target object” (see column 1, lines 62 – 66). Finally, Tyler concludes, “the present apparatus thus provides greatly increased freedom of... movement” (see column 2, lines 45 – 47). It clear based upon the statements by Viney that there is need to provide the total station incorporating a camera with the capability of accurately acquiring and targeting an object, including making fine tuning adjustments, while simultaneously reducing user involvement. Albeit, it also clear based upon the statements by Tyler that there is also need to provide a surveillance (target-tracking) platform also incorporating a camera with greater freedom of movement while simultaneously gyroscopically stabilizing the platform. Hence, the greater freedom of movement and stabilizing teachings of Tyler would ONLY improve upon the total station disclosed by Viney. Thus, a total station

Art Unit: 2622

incorporating a camera that is provided with a greater freedom of movement and that is gyroscopically stabilized would definitely result in additional capability by allowing fine tuning adjustments and would definitely reduce user involvement.

5. Additionally, Applicant makes several arguments regarding the structural combination of Viney and Tyler. One particular argument is, "it is respectfully submitted that the Final Office Action is not merely suggesting a minor, obvious modification to Viney patent to make a hypothetical 'gyroscopically stable surveying machine,' but this modification requires the replacement of several major components of both references, including internal and external structural changes that are not taught or suggested (implied or otherwise) by either reference." Another particular argument is, "hypothetically, the total station 1 of Viney in combination with Tyler would supposedly have the capability to move in the third orthogonal axis, but Viney remote RCVU would not be able to move the total station 1 in that third axis."

6. In response to Applicant argument's regarding the structural combination of Viney and Tyler, Applicant is reminded, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In the above response, the Examiner has demonstrated what the combined teachings would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 2622

7. Finally, the Examiner has successfully traversed Applicant's arguments in regards to independent Claim 1; thus, Applicant's arguments with regard to dependent Claims 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17 are now moot.

Claims 19 – 48

8. Applicant argues, "The input unit 21 refers to a collective or an aggregate of a plurality of controls that are part of the Remote Control and Viewing Unit 3 (RCVU) of the Viney reference. The various elements that comprise Viney's input unit 21 grouping include 'an aiming control 31, a focus control 32, a trigger input 33, and an alphanumeric input device 34.' (See column 5, lines 56-58). Therefore, the 'input unit 21' itself does not control any one function, and in fact, is not a control, but rather a grouping or arrangement of controls. This is distinguished from Applicant's 'one or more imaging platform motion controls' that are actual controls rather than a grouping or arrangement."

9. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's position. Viney's input section (21) of the remote control (3) comprises a plurality of actual platform controls (31, 32, 34). This feature is even admitted by Applicant (see Remarks pages 10 and 11). However, for the sake of clarity, the Examiner has modified the application of Viney (see rejections below for details). Thus, Applicant's above arguments are now moot.

10. Applicant additionally argues, "the aiming control 31 is merely used to *move* the total station, and has nothing to do with a camera, much less be a camera control handle having one or more camera functions."

11. The Examiner again respectfully disagrees with Applicant's position. Viney's total station is inoperable without the attached video camera (see column 2, line 66 – column 3, line

Art Unit: 2622

29). Viney indicates that the aiming control (31) is used to move the total station such that the total station is aligned with the target image captured by the video camera (see column 6, lines 50 – 54). Clearly, the aiming control (31) of the RCVU (3) functions as the pan and tilt control of the video camera (11) – thus, the aiming control (31) controls one or more camera functions as claimed.

Claim Objections

12. **Claims 24, 25, 39, and 40** are objected to because of the following informalities:
inconsistent claim language.

For the above-listed claims, the respective parent claims recite therein, “one or more imaging platform motion controls”. However, each of the above-listed claims recites therein, “wherein the imaging platform motion control further comprises”. The above-listed claims should be made consistent with their respective parent claim. The Examiner suggests the following change: “wherein the one or more imaging platform motion controls further comprises”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2622

14. **Claims 19 – 29, 31 – 44, and 46 – 48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Viney et al.

15. For **Claim 19**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figures 1 – 4 and as stated in columns 2 (lines 66 and 67), 3 (lines 16 – 29, 43 – 45, and 56 – 58), 4 (lines 10 – 23 and 63 – 67), 5 (lines 1 – 4 and 12 – 67), and 6 (lines 28 – 32, 44 – 48, and 55 – 60), a remote control (3) comprising:

a video display (20) for displaying the output of an imaging device (11);

one or more imaging platform motion controls (any one or combination of aiming 31, focus 32, trigger 33, and/or alphanumeric 34);

at least one of iris, zoom, and focus controller (32) for the imaging device; and

a camera control handle (aiming control 31) having one or more camera functions (see explanation below).

Viney's total station is inoperable without the attached video camera (see column 2, line 66 – column 3, line 29). Viney indicates that the aiming control (31) is used to move the total station such that the total station is aligned with the target image captured by the video camera (see column 6, lines 50 – 54). Clearly, the aiming control (31) of the RCVU (3) functions as the pan and tilt control of the video camera (11) – thus, the aiming control (31) controls one or more camera functions as claimed.

16. For **Claim 34**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figures 1 – 4 and as stated in columns 2 (lines 66 and 67), 3 (lines 16 – 29, 43 – 45, and 56 – 58), 4 (lines 10 – 23 and 63 – 67), 5 (lines 1 – 4 and 12 – 67), and 6 (lines 28 – 32, 44 – 48, and 55 – 60), in a conventional arrangement for remotely operating an imaging device (11) and an imaging platform (1), including a plurality of operators and operating equipment (1 and 3), wherein the improvement consists of:

a remote control (3) having a video display (20) for displaying the output of the imaging device (11), one or more imaging platform motion controls (any one or combination of aiming 31, focus 32, trigger 33, and/or alphanumeric 34), at least one of iris, zoom, and focus controller (32) for the imaging device (11), and a camera control handle (aiming control 31) having one or more camera functions (see explanation below).

Viney's total station is inoperable without the attached video camera (see column 2, line 66 – column 3, line 29). Viney indicates that the aiming control (31) is used to move the total station such that the total station is aligned with the target image captured by the video camera (see column 6, lines 50 – 54). Clearly, the aiming control (31) of the RCVU (3) functions as the pan and tilt control of the video camera (11) – thus, the aiming control (31) controls one or more camera functions as claimed.

17. As for **Claims 20 and 35**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the remote control (3) further comprises a video receiver interface (22, 23, 24, and 27).

18. As for **Claims 21 and 36**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the video receiver interface (22, 23, 24, and 27) further comprises an external video receiver interface (23). The antenna (23) is an interface to receive external video.

19. As for **Claims 22 and 37**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the video receiver interface (22, 23, and 24, and 27) further comprises multiple video receivers, in a series/parallel combination circuit. The video receiver interface consists of antenna (23), transceiver (22), control logic (24), and video chip (27), which is series/parallel combination circuit.

20. As for **Claims 23 and 38**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated in column 5 (lines 27 – 33), the video receiver interface (22, 23, and 24, and 27) further comprises an exchangeable video receiver (exchangeable for software implementation rather than hardware implementation).
21. As for **Claims 24 and 39**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated in column 5 (lines 58 – 61), wherein the imaging platform motion control (any one or combination of aiming 31, focus 32, trigger 33, and/or alphanumeric 34) further comprises a joystick (31).
22. As for **Claims 25 and 40**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated in column 5 (lines 58 – 61), wherein the imaging platform motion control (any one or combination of aiming 31, focus 32, trigger 33, and/or alphanumeric 34) further comprises a selectable response speed controller (31). The imaging platform motion control (31) may be a joystick, trackball, touchpad, or any other suitable device, all of which whose response speed is directly proportional to the user's (selectable) operational speed (speed at which the user operates the motion control).
23. As for **Claims 26 and 41**, Viney et al. disclose, as stated in column 5 (lines 64 – 67), wherein the at least one of iris, zoom, and focus controller (32) further comprises a corresponding fine adjustment controller.
24. As for **Claims 27 and 42**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the remote control (3) further comprises an independent power source (26).
25. As for **Claims 28 and 43**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the independent power source (26) further comprises one or more batteries (26).

Art Unit: 2622

26. As for **Claims 29 and 44**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated column 5 (lines 34 – 43), wherein the video display further comprises a video monitor.

27. As for **Claims 31 and 46**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figures 3 and 4 and as stated in column 6 (lines 44 – 67), wherein the remote control (3) further comprises a programming display (20) and control. The display (20) serves as a video display for displaying received images and as a control display for adjusting the field of view.

28. As for **Claims 32 and 47**, Viney et al. disclose, as stated in columns 4 (lines 5 – 10) and 7 (lines 26 – 28), an ob-board communication package (22 and 23) allowing interaction between a remote control operator (at 3) and other personnel (at 1). As stated, a user may be at the imaging platform adjusting the imaging device and a user may be at the remote control operating the imaging platform.

29. As for **Claims 33 and 48**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated in column 5 (lines 18 – 26), wherein the remote control further comprises a wireless connection to at least one of the imaging device (11) or imaging platform (1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

30. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

31. **Claims 1 – 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viney et al. in view of Tyler.

Art Unit: 2622

32. For **Claim 1**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figures 1 – 4 and as stated in columns 2 (lines 66 and 67), 3 (lines 16 – 29, 43 – 45, and 56 – 58), 4 (lines 10 – 23 and 63 – 67), 5 (lines 1 – 4 and 12 – 67), and 6 (lines 28 – 32, 44 – 48, and 55 – 60), a remote control imaging system comprising:

an imaging device (11) supported by an imaging platform (1); and

a remote control (3) having a video display (20) for displaying the output of the imaging device (11), one or more imaging platform motion controls (input unit 21), at least one of iris, zoom, and focus controller (32) for the imaging device (11), and a camera control handle (aiming control 31).

While, Viney et al. disclose that the imaging platform (1) is capable of controllable motion about two orthogonal axes (see column 5, lines 1 – 4), Viney et al. do not disclose wherein the imaging platform is capable of controllable motion about three orthogonal axes.

On the other hand, Tyler also discloses an imaging platform. More specifically, Tyler discloses, as shown figure 1 and as stated in columns 4 (lines 40 – 45 and 64 – 68) and 5 (lines 1 – 18), controllably moving the imaging platform (10) about a vertical axis; controllably moving the imaging platform (10) about a horizontal axis (22) that is orthogonal to the vertical axis; and controllably moving the camera about a second horizontal axis (20) that is orthogonal to the horizontal axis (22) and the vertical axis. As stated in columns 1 (lines 61 – 65) and 2 (lines 20 – 25), at the time the invention was made, one with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include an imaging platform that is capable of controllable motion about three orthogonal axis, as taught by Tyler, in the remote control imaging system, disclosed by Viney et al., as a means to provide a gyroscopically stable imaging platform with a greater degree

movement. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to have included an imaging platform that is capable of controllable motion about three orthogonal axis, as taught by Tyler, in the remote control imaging system, disclosed by Viney et al.

33. As for **Claim 2**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated in column 5 (lines 18 – 26 and 48 – 63), the system of Claim 1 further comprising: a camera system control (13, 15, 16, 22, 23, and 24) for providing wireless interconnection (8) between the imaging device (11) and the remote control (3), the camera system control having multiple independent channels of operation (circuits connected to control logic 13 and circuits connected to control logic 24) for at least one of iris, zoom, and focus controller (32), and proportional control outputs to the imaging device (11).

34. As for **Claim 3**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, the system of Claim 2 further comprising: a camera interface (connection between camera 11 and control logic 13) for connecting an imaging device (11) and a camera system control (13).

35. As for **Claim 4**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 1 and as stated in columns 4 (lines 63 – 67) and 5 (lines 1 – 4), the system of Claim 1 further comprising: a universal adapter (connection between the tripod and the imaging platform 1) for connecting the imaging platform (1) to a variety of support devices (tripod and L-bracket, clearly shown in figure 1).

36. As for **Claim 5**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the remote control (3) further comprises a video receiver interface (22, 23, 24, and 27).

Art Unit: 2622

37. As for **Claim 6**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the video receiver interface (22, 23, 24, and 27) further comprises an external video receiver interface (23). The antenna (23) is an interface to receive external video.

38. As for **Claim 7** (please see the objection to the Specification corresponding to these claims), Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the video receiver interface (22, 23, and 24, and 27) further comprises multiple video receivers, in a series/parallel combination circuit. The video receiver interface consists of antenna (23), transceiver (22), control logic (24), and video chip (27), which is series/parallel combination circuit.

39. As for **Claim 8**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated in column 5 (lines 27 – 33), the video receiver interface (22, 23, and 24, and 27) further comprises an exchangeable video receiver (exchangeable for software implementation rather than hardware implementation).

40. As for **Claim 9**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated in column 5 (lines 58 – 61), wherein the imaging platform motion control (input unit 21) further comprises a joystick (31).

41. As for **Claim 10**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated in column 5 (lines 58 – 61), wherein the imaging platform motion control (input unit 21) further comprises a selectable response speed controller (31). The imaging platform motion control (31) may be a joystick, trackball, touchpad, or any other suitable device, all of which whose response speed is directly proportional to the user's (selectable) operational speed (speed at which the user operates the motion control).

42. As for **Claim 11**, Viney et al. disclose, as stated in column 5 (lines 64 – 67), wherein the at least one of iris, zoom, and focus controller (32) further comprises a corresponding fine adjustment controller.

43. As for **Claim 12**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the remote control (3) further comprises an independent power source (26).

44. As for **Claim 13**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3, wherein the independent power source (26) further comprises one or more batteries (26).

45. As for **Claim 14**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated column 5 (lines 34 – 43), wherein the video display further comprises a video monitor.

46. As for **Claim 15**, Viney et al. disclose a video display (20); however, Viney et al. do not disclose wherein the video display (20) comprises a television tuner. **Official Notice** is taken that both the concepts and advantages of providing a video display comprising a television tuner are well know and expected in the art as means to provide entertainment to the remote control operator when the imaging device is not in use.

47. As for **Claim 16**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figures 3 and 4 and as stated in column 6 (lines 44 – 67), wherein the remote control (3) further comprises a programming display (20) and control. The display (20) serves as a video display for displaying received images and as a control display for adjusting the field of view.

48. As for **Claim 17**, Viney et al. disclose, as stated in columns 4 (lines 5 – 10) and 7 (lines 26 – 28), an on-board communication package (22 and 23) allowing interaction between a remote control operator (at 3) and other personnel (at 1). As stated, a user may be at the imaging

Art Unit: 2622

platform adjusting the imaging device and a user may be at the remote control operating the imaging platform.

49. As for **Claim 18**, Viney et al. disclose, as shown in figure 3 and as stated in column 5 (lines 18 – 26), wherein the remote control further comprises a wireless connection to at least one of the imaging device (11) or imaging platform (1).

50. **Claims 30 and 45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viney et al.

51. As for **Claims 30 and 45**, Viney et al. disclose a video display (20); however, Viney et al. do not disclose wherein the video display (20) comprises a television tuner.

However, **Official Notice** (MPEP § 2144.03) is taken that both the concepts and advantages of providing a video display comprising a television tuner are well known and expected in the art. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to have providing a video display comprising a television tuner for the advantage of providing a user with entertainment.

Conclusion

52. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Justin P Misleh whose telephone number is 571.272.7313. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, David L Ometz can be reached on 571.272.7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571.273.3000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JPM

March 31, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Ometz', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER